Variable-Length Resolvability for General Sources and Channels

Hideki Yagi Te Sun Han

arXiv:1701.08712v1 [cs.IT] 30 Jan 2017

Abstract

We introduce the problem of *variable-length* source resolvability, where a given target probability distribution is approximated by encoding a *variable-length* uniform random number, and the asymptotically minimum average length rate of the uniform random numbers, called the (variable-length) resolvability, is investigated. We first analyze the variable-length resolvability with the variational distance as an approximation measure. Next, we investigate the case under the divergence as an approximation measure. When the asymptotically exact approximation is required, it is shown that the resolvability under the two kinds of approximation measures coincides. We then extend the analysis to the case of *channel resolvability*, where the target distribution is the output distribution via a general channel due to the fixed general source as an input. The obtained characterization of the channel resolvability is fully general in the sense that when the channel is just the identity mapping, the characterization reduces to the general formula for the source resolvability. We also analyze the second-order variable-length resolvability.

I. Introduction

Generating a random number subject to a given probability distribution has a number of applications such as in information security, statistical machine learning, and computer science. From the viewpoint of information theory, random number generation may be considered to be a transformation (encoding) of sequences emitted from a given source, called a *coin distribution*, into other sequences via a deterministic mapping [2], [4], [11]. There have been two major types of the problems of random number generation: *intrinsic randomness* [6], [20] and (source) *resolvability* [8], [17]. In the former case, a fixed-length uniform random number is extracted from an arbitrary coin distribution, and we want to find the *maximum* achievable rate of the uniform random numbers. In the latter case, in contrast, a fixed-length uniform random number used as a coin distribution is encoded to approximate a given *target distribution*, and we want to find the *minimum* achievable rate of the uniform random numbers. Thus, there is a duality between these two problems.

The problem of intrinsic randomness has been extended to the case of *variable-length* uniform random numbers, for which the length of the random numbers may vary. This problem, referred to as the *variable-length intrinsic randomness*, was first introduced by Vembu and Verdú [20] for a finite source alphabet and later extended by Han [6] to a countably infinite alphabet. The use of variable-length uniform random numbers can generally increase the average length rate of the uniform random numbers compared to the fixed-length ones. This fact raises the natural question: can we also decrease the average length rate in the resolvability problem by using variable-length uniform random numbers? Despite the duality between the two problems of random number generation, the counterpart in the resolvability problem has not yet been discussed yet.

In this paper, we introduce the problem of *variable-length* source/channel resolvability, where a given target probability distribution is approximated by encoding a *variable-length* uniform random number. Distance measures between the target distribution and the approximated distribution are used to measure the fineness of approximation. We first analyze the fundamental limit on the variable-length source resolvability with the variational distance as an approximation measure in Sec. III and IV. We use the smooth Rényi entropy of order one [16] to characterize the δ-source resolvability, which is defined as the minimum achievable length rate of uniform random numbers with the asymptotic distance less than or equal to $\delta \in [0, 1)$. In the proof of the direct part, we will develop a simple version of *information spectrum slicing* [4], in which each "sliced" information density quantized to an

This research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP16K06340 and 26289119.

H. Yagi is with the Dept. of Computer and Network Engineering, University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan (email: h.yagi@uec.ac.jp).

T. S. Han is with the National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT), Tokyo, Japan (email: han@is.uec.ac.jp).

integer is approximated by a fixed-length uniform random number. Due to the simplicity of the method, the analysis on the average rate and the variational distance is facilitated. We then extend the analysis to the case under the (unnormalized) divergence as an approximation measure in Sec. V. When $\delta = 0$, that is, the asymptotically exact approximation is required, it is shown that the 0-source resolvability under the two kinds of approximation measures coincides with each other.

In Sec. VI, we then consider the problem of *channel resolvability* [8], in which not only a source but a channel is fixed and the output distribution via the channel is now the target of approximation. We consider two types of problems in which either a general source (*mean-channel resolvability*) or a variable-length uniform random number (*variable-length channel resolvability*) is used as a coin distribution. It is shown that the established formulas are equal for both coin distributions. In the special case where the channel is the identity mapping, the established formulas reduce to those in source resolvability established in Sec. III–Sec. V. We also analyze the second-order fundamental limits on the variable-length channel/source resolvability in Sec. VII. In this paper, it is shown that the variable-length δ-*source* resolvability under the variational distance is equal to the minimum achievable rate by *fixed-to-variable length source codes* with the error probability less than or equal to δ. It is demonstrated that this close relationship provides a single letter characterization for the first- and second-order source resolvability under the variational distance when the source is stationary and memoryless.

II. Fixed-Length Resolvability: Review

Let $\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$ be a finite alphabet of size K, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a finite or countably infinite alphabet. Let $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a *general source* [4], where P_{X^n} is a probability distribution on $\mathcal{X}^n$. We do not impose any assumptions such as stationarity or ergodicity. In this paper, we identify X^n with its probability distribution P_{X^n}, and these symbols are used interchangeably.

We first review the problem of *fixed-length* (source) resolvability [4] using the variational distance as an approximation measure. Let U_{M_n} denote the *uniform random number*, which is a random variable *uniformly* distributed over $\mathcal{U}_{M_n} := \{1, \ldots, M_n\}$. Consider the problem of approximating the *target distribution* P_{X^n} by using U_{M_n} as the *coin distribution* via a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \{1, \ldots, M_n\} \to \mathcal{X}^n$. Denoting $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U_{M_n})$, we want to make $P_{\tilde{X}^n}$ approximate P_{X^n} (cf. Figure 1). A standard choice of the performance measure of approximation is

$$d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} |P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})|, \tag{1}$$

which is referred to as the *variational distance* between P_{X^n} and $P_{\tilde{X}^n}$. It is easily seen that

$$0 \le d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) \le 1. \tag{2}$$

Let us now define the problem for *source resolvability*.

Definition 1 (Fixed-Length Resolvability): A resolution rate $R \ge 0$ is said to be *fixed-length achievable* or simply f-*achievable* (under the variational distance) if there exists a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \{1, \ldots, M_n\} \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying[1]

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_n \le R, \tag{3}$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) = 0, \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U_{M_n})$ and U_{M_n} is the uniform random number over $\mathcal{U}_{M_n}$. The infimum of f-achievable rates:

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is f-achievable}\} \tag{5}$$

is called the *fixed-length resolvability* or simply f-*resolvability*. □

The following result is given by Han and Verdú [8].

Theorem 1 (Han and Verdú [8]): For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{6}$$

[1]Throughout this paper, logarithms are of base K.


Want to approximate target distribution with blocks of equal size
Target distribution
Approximation by coin distribution

Fig. 1. Illustration of the problem of fixed-length resolvability

where

$$\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\left\{a : \lim_{n\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{P_{X^n}(X^n)} > a\right\} = 0\right\}. \tag{7}$$

□

The following problem is called the δ-*resolvability problem* [4], [17], which relaxes the condition on the variational distance, compared to (4).

Definition 2 (δ-Fixed-Length Resolvability): For a fixed $\delta \in [0,1)$, a resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be δ-*fixed-length achievable* or simply $\mathrm{f}(\delta)$-*achievable* (under the variational distance) if there exists a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \{1,\ldots,M_n\} \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log M_n \leq R, \tag{8}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) \leq \delta, \tag{9}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U_{M_n})$ and U_{M_n} is the uniform random number over $\mathcal{U}_{M_n}$. The infimum of all $\mathrm{f}(\delta)$-achievable rates:

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is } \mathrm{f}(\delta)\text{-achievable}\} \tag{10}$$

is referred to as the δ-*fixed-length resolvability* or simply $\mathrm{f}(\delta)$-*resolvability*. □

Theorem 2 (Steinberg and Verdú [17]): For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)), \tag{11}$$

where

$$\overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\left\{a : \limsup_{n\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{P_{X^n}(X^n)} > a\right\} \leq \delta\right\}. \tag{12}$$

□

Remark 1: The fixed-length resolvability problem is deeply related to the *fixed-length source coding* problem allowing the probability of decoding error up to ε. Denoting by $R_{\mathrm{f}}(\varepsilon|\boldsymbol{X})$ the *minimum achievable rate* for the source $\boldsymbol{X}$, there is the relationship [17]:

$$R_{\mathrm{f}}(\varepsilon|\boldsymbol{X}) = \overline{H}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \varepsilon \in [0,1)) \tag{13}$$

and hence, by Theorem 2,

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = R_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{14}$$

□

III. Variable-Length Resolvability: Variational Distance

In this section, we introduce the problem of *variable-length* resolvability, where the target probability distribution is approximated by encoding a *variable-length uniform random number*. As an initial step, we analyze the fundamental limit on the variable-length resolvability with the variational distance as an approximation measure.

A. Definitions

Let $\mathcal{U}^*$ denote the set of all sequences $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m$ over $m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, where $\mathcal{U}^0 = \{\lambda\}$ (λ is the null string). Let L_n denote a random variable which takes a value in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. We define the *variable-length uniform random number* $U^{(L_n)}$ so that $U^{(m)}$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{U}^m$ given $L_n = m$. In other words,

$$P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) := \Pr\{U^{(L_n)} = \boldsymbol{u}, L_n = m\} = \frac{\Pr\{L_n = m\}}{K^m} \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m), \tag{15}$$

$$\Pr\{U^{(L_n)} = \boldsymbol{u} | L_n = m\} = \frac{P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m)}{\Pr\{L_n = m\}} = \frac{1}{K^m} \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m), \tag{16}$$

where $K = |\mathcal{U}|$. It should be noticed that the variable-length sequence $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m$ is generated with joint probability $P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m)$.

Definition 3 (Variable-Length Resolvability: Variational Distance): A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *variable-length achievable* or simply v-*achievable* (under the variational distance) if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq R, \tag{17}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) = 0, \tag{18}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value and $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all v-achievable rates:

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is v-achievable}\} \tag{19}$$

is called the *variable-length resolvability* or simply v-*resolvability*. □

Remark 2: One may think that condition (17) can be replaced with the condition on the sup-entropy rate:

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U^{(L_n)}) \leq R \tag{20}$$

as in [8]. Indeed, both conditions yield the same resolvability result. To see this, let us denote by $\tilde{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ the infimum of v-achievable rates R under constraints (18) and (20). It is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[L_n] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \log K^m &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \log \frac{\Pr\{L_n = m\}}{P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m)} \\ &= H(U^{(L_n)}) - H(L_n) \leq H(U^{(L_n)}).\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

This implies $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq \tilde{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$. On the other hand, by invoking the well-known relation (cf. [3, Corollary 3.12]) it holds that

$$H(L_n) \leq \log(e \cdot \mathbb{E}[L_n]). \tag{22}$$

Consider any resolution rate $R > S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$. Then, (17) holds for some $U^{(L_n)}$ and φ_n and hence (22) leads to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(L_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(e \cdot \mathbb{E}[L_n]) = 0. \tag{23}$$

From this equation, (21) yields that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U^{(L_n)}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq R \tag{24}$$

to obtain $R \geq \tilde{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$, implying that $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \geq \tilde{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$. Thus, $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \tilde{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

Using (20) in place of (17), the same remark applies to other resolvability problems addressed in the subsequent sections. □

B. General Formula

In this section, we use the following information quantity for a general source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. For $\delta \in [0,1)$ we define

$$G_{[\delta]}(X^n) = \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{A}_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n: \\ \Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{A}_n\} \geq 1-\delta}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_n} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}. \tag{25}$$

The $G_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Based on this quantity, we define

$$G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} G_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{26}$$

Then, we have the following basic theorem:

Theorem 3: For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{27}$$

□

The proof of this theorem is given below subsequently to Remark 3.

It has been shown by Han [4] that any source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying the *uniform integrability* (cf. Han [4]) satisfies

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = H(\boldsymbol{X}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(X^n), \tag{28}$$

where $H(\boldsymbol{X})$ is called *sup-entropy rate*. Notice here, in particular, that the finiteness of an alphabet implies the uniform integrability [4]. Thus, we obtain the following corollary from Theorem 3.

Corollary 1: For any finite alphabet target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = H(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{29}$$

□

Remark 3: As in the case of *fixed-length* resolvability and *fixed-length* source coding problems, $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is tightly related to *variable-length source codes* with vanishing decoding error probabilities. Denoting by $R_{\mathrm{v}}^*(\boldsymbol{X})$ the *minimum error-vanishing variable-length achievable rate* for source $\boldsymbol{X}$, Han [5] has shown that

$$R_{\mathrm{v}}^*(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{30}$$

and hence, from Theorem 3 it is concluded that

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = R_{\mathrm{v}}^*(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{31}$$

In addition, if a general source $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfies the *uniform integrability* and the strong converse property (cf. Han [4]), then equation (28) holds and hence it follows from [4, Theorem 1.7.1] that

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = R_{\mathrm{v}}^*(\boldsymbol{X}) = R_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = R_{\mathrm{f}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = H(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{32}$$

where $R_{\mathrm{f}}(\boldsymbol{X}) := R_{\mathrm{f}}(0|\boldsymbol{X})$ and $R_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the minimum achievable rate of variable-length source codes with zero error probabilities for all $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. □

Proof of Theorem 3

An achievability scheme parallels the one given in the proof of Theorem 5 below with due modifications, so it is omitted here. We shall prove the converse part here. The converse part is based on the following lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 1: Let $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{\tilde{X}^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a pair of general sources satisfying

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) = 0. \tag{33}$$

Then,

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{34}$$

□

Now let $R \geq 0$ be variable-length achievable. Then, there exists $U^{(L_n)}$ and φ_n satisfying (17) and (18). It follows from (21) that

$$H(\tilde{X}^n) \leq H(U^{(L_n)}) = \mathbb{E}[L_n] + H(L_n), \tag{35}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$ and the inequality is due to the fact that φ_n is a deterministic mapping. It follows from (35) that

$$H(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\tilde{X}^n) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(L_n) \leq R, \tag{36}$$

where we have used (17) and (23) for the last inequality. Lemma 1 with $\delta = 0$ implies

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}) \leq H(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}), \tag{37}$$

and thus by (36)

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq R, \tag{38}$$

completing the proof of the converse part. □

Han and Verdú [8] have discussed the problem of *mean-resolvability* for the target distribution P_{X^n} over a *finite* alphabet $\mathcal{X}^n$. In this problem, the coin distribution may be a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{\tilde{X}^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where $\tilde{X}^n$ is a random variable which takes values in $\mathcal{X}^n$ with length rate $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n]$ in (17) replaced with the entropy rate $\frac{1}{n}H(\tilde{X}^n)$. Denoting by $\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ the mean-resolvability, which is defined as the infimum of v-achievable rates for a general source $\boldsymbol{X}$ with *countably infinite* alphabet, we can easily verify that any mean-resolution rate $R > \overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ must satisfy

$$R \geq \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \tag{39}$$

by the same reasoning in the proof of the converse part of Theorem 3. Since $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \geq \overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X})$ by definition, this fact together with Theorem 3 indicates the following theorem, which gives a generalization of the general formula for source resolvability established in [8] for a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X}$:

Theorem 4: For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{40}$$

□

IV. δ-Variable-Length Resolvability: Variational Distance

A. Definitions

As a natural generalization of the previous preliminary section, let us now introduce the δ-resolvability problem under the variational distance using the variable-length random number, called the *δ-variable-length resolvability* or simply *$\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-resolvability*.

Definition 4 (δ-Variable-Length Resolvability: Variational Distance): A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *δ-variable-length achievable* or simply *$\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable* (under the variational distance) with $\delta \in [0,1)$ if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq R, \tag{41}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) \leq \delta, \tag{42}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable rates:

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is } \mathrm{v}(\delta)\text{-achievable}\} \tag{43}$$

is referred to as the *δ-variable-length resolvability* or simply $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-resolvability. □

B. Smooth Rényi Entropy of Order One

To establish a general formula for $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$, we introduce the following quantity for a general source $\boldsymbol{X}$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ denote the set of all probability distributions on $\mathcal{X}^n$. For $\delta \in [0,1)$, defining the δ-*ball* using the variational distance as

$$B_\delta(X^n) = \{P_{V^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n) : d(P_{X^n}, P_{V^n}) \le \delta\}, \tag{44}$$

we introduce the *smooth Rényi entropy* of order one:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{[\delta]}(X^n) &:= \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &= \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)} H(V^n), \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where $H(V^n)$ denotes the Shannon entropy of P_{V^n}. The $H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Based on this quantity for a general source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we define

$$H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{46}$$

Remark 4: Renner and Wolf [16] have defined the *smooth Rény entropy of order* $\alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1,\infty)$ as

$$H^\alpha_{[\delta]}(X^n) = \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})^\alpha. \tag{47}$$

By letting $\alpha \uparrow 1$, we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^\alpha_{[\delta]}(X^n) = H_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{48}$$

As for the proof, see Appendix B. □

C. General Formula

The following theorem indicates that the $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-resolvability $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ can be characterized by the smooth Rényi entropy of order one for $\boldsymbol{X}$.

Theorem 5: For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)). \tag{49}$$

□

Remark 5: In formula (49), the limit $\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0}$ of the offset term $+\gamma$ appears in the characterization of $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$. This is because the smooth entropy $H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ for X^n involves the infimum over the *nonasymptotic* δ-ball $B_\delta(X^n)$ for a given length n. Alternatively, we may consider the *asymptotic* δ-ball defined as

$$B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{V} = \{V^n\}_{n=1}^\infty : \limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{V^n}) \le \delta \right\}, \tag{50}$$

and then we obtain the alternative formula

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{V} \in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)) \tag{51}$$

without an offset term, where

$$H(\boldsymbol{V}) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(V^n) \tag{52}$$

is the *sup-entropy rate* for $\boldsymbol{V}$. The proof of (51) is given in Appendix C. The same remark applies to other general formulas established in the subsequent sections. □

Remark 6: Independently of this work, Tomita, Uyematsu, and Matsumoto [18] recently have investigated the following problem: the coin distribution is given by *fair coin tossing* and the average number of coin tosses should

be asymptotically minimized while the variational distance between the target and approximated distributions should satisfy (42). In this case, the asymptotically minimum average number of coin tosses is also characterized by the right-hand side (r.h.s.) of (49) (cf. [18]). Since the coin distribution is restricted to the one given by fair coin tossing with a stopping algorithm, the realizations of L_n must satisfy the Kraft inequality (prefix codes), whereas the problem addressed in this paper allows the probability distribution of L_n to be an arbitrary discrete distribution, not necessarily implying prefix codes. In this sense, our problem is more relaxed, while out coin is constrained to be conditionally independent given L_n. Theorem 5 indicates that the $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-resolvability does not change in both problems. Later, we shall show that even in the case where the coin distribution may be any general source $\boldsymbol{X}$, the δ-resolvability remains still the same (cf. Theorem 7 and Remark 11). □

Remark 7: Analogously to the case $\delta = 0$, there is a deep relation between this δ-resolvability problem and δ-variable-length source coding with error probability asymptotically not exceeding δ. Han [5] and Koga and Yamamoto [10] have shown that the minimum average length rate $R^*_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ of δ-variable-length source codes is given by

$$R^*_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{53}$$

Theorem 5 and Proposition 1 to be shown below reveal that

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = R^*_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{54}$$

□

The following proposition shows a general relationship between $G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ and $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

Proposition 1: For any general source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le (1-\delta)\overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{55}$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le (1-\delta)\overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{56}$$

(*Proof*) See Appendix D. □

In view of Theorems 2 and 5, Proposition 1 implies that we have $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \le (1-\delta)S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ for all $\delta \in [0,1)$, where $S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the $\mathrm{f}(\delta)$-resolvability. This relationship elucidates the significance of the use of variable-length uniform random numbers to minimize the average length rate. The proposition also demonstrates that $G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ coincides with $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ for all $\delta \in [0,1)$ for any general source $\boldsymbol{X}$.

Example 1 (i.i.d. source): Let $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a source with i.i.d. $X^n = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$. By the weak law of large numbers, $\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{P_{X^n}(X^n)}$ (the sum of independent random variables) converges to the Shannon entropy $H(X_1)$ in probability. Therefore,

$$S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X}) = H(X_1) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)).$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = (1-\delta)H(X_1) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)), \tag{57}$$

where the second and third equalities are due to Proposition 1 and [10, Appendix III], respectively. Thus, we have $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \le S_{\mathrm{f}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$, where the inequality is strict for $\delta \in (0,1)$ if $H(X_1) > 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 5

1) Converse Part: Let R be $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable. Then, there exists $U^{(L_n)}$ and φ_n satisfying (41) and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \delta_n \le \delta, \tag{58}$$

where we define $\delta_n = d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n})$ with $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. Equation (58) implies that for any given $\gamma > 0$, $\delta_n \le \delta + \gamma$ for all $n \ge n_0$ with some $n_0 > 0$, and therefore

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) \le H_{[\delta_n]}(X^n) \quad (\forall n \ge n_0), \tag{59}$$

because $H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Since $P_{\tilde{X}^n} \in B_{\delta_n}(X^n)$, we have

$$H_{[\delta_n]}(X^n) \le H(\tilde{X}^n). \tag{60}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (21) that

$$H(\tilde{X}^n) \le H(U^{(L_n)}) = \mathbb{E}[L_n] + H(L_n), \tag{61}$$

where the inequality is due to the fact that φ_n is a deterministic mapping and $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$.

Combining (59)–(61) yields

$$\begin{aligned} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) &= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(L_n) \le R, \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where we have used (23) and (41) for the last inequality. Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le R. \tag{63}$$

□

2) Direct Part: Without loss of generality, we assume that $H^* := \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is finite ($H^* < +\infty$). Letting $R = H^* + 3\gamma$, where $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, we shall show that R is $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable. In what follows, we use a simpler form of *information spectrum slicing* [4], where each sliced information quantized to a positive integer ℓ is approximated by the uniform random number $U^{(\ell)}$ of length ℓ.

First, we note that

$$H^* \ge H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \ge \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) - \gamma \quad (\forall n > n_0) \tag{64}$$

because of the monotonicity of $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ in δ. Let V^n be a random variable subject to $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n)$ which satisfies

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) + \gamma \ge H(V^n). \tag{65}$$

For $\gamma > 0$, we can choose $c_n > 0$ so large that

$$\Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \le \gamma \tag{66}$$

where

$$T_n := \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \le c_n \right\}. \tag{67}$$

We also define

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{x}) := \begin{cases} \lceil \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} + n\gamma \rceil & \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{68}$$

Letting for $m = 0, 1, \ldots, \beta_n := \lceil n(c_n + \gamma) \rceil$

$$S_n(m) := \{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \ell(\boldsymbol{x}) = m \}, \tag{69}$$

these sets form a partition of $\mathcal{X}^n$. i.e.,

$$\bigcup_{m=0}^{\beta_n} S_n(m) = \mathcal{X}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{m=1}^{\beta_n} S_n(m) = T_n. \tag{70}$$

We set L_n so that

$$\Pr\{L_n = m\} = \Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}, \tag{71}$$

where it is obvious that $\sum_{m=0}^{\beta_n} \Pr\{L_n = m\} = 1$, and hence the probability distribution of the variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ is

$$P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) := \Pr\{U^{(L_n)} = \boldsymbol{u}, L_n = m\} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m). \tag{72}$$

Construction of Mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$:
Index the elements in $S_n(m)$ as $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{|S_n(m)|}$ $(m = 1, 2, \cdots)$, where

$$|S_n(m)| \le K^{m - n\gamma} \tag{73}$$

since for $\boldsymbol{x} \in S_n(m)$

$$\log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \le m - n\gamma \iff P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge K^{-(m-n\gamma)}, \tag{74}$$

and therefore

$$1 \ge \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in S_n(m)} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in S_n(m)} K^{-(m-n\gamma)} = |S_n(m)| K^{-(m-n\gamma)}. \tag{75}$$

For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$, define $\tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ as the set of sequences $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m$ so that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \le P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) < \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) + \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} \tag{76}$$

and

$$\tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \cap \tilde{A}_j^{(m)} = \emptyset \quad (i \ne j). \tag{77}$$

If

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) < \sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}, \tag{78}$$

then add a $\boldsymbol{u}_i \in \mathcal{U}^m \setminus (\cup_j \tilde{A}_j^{(m)})$ to obtain

$$A_i^{(m)} = \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \cup \{\boldsymbol{u}_i\} \tag{79}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ in order, until it holds that with some $1 \le c \le |S_n(m)|$

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{c} A_i^{(m)} \cup \bigcup_{i=c+1}^{|S_n(m)|} \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} = \mathcal{U}^m, \tag{80}$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, \cdots$ are selected to be all different. Since $|\mathcal{U}^m| = K^m$ and

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} = \Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}, \tag{81}$$

such $1 \le c \le |S_n(m)|$ always exists. For simplicity, we set for $i = c+1, c+2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$

$$A_i^{(m)} = \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \tag{82}$$

and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$

$$\varphi_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{x}_i \ \text{ for } \boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}, \tag{83}$$

which defines the random variable $\tilde{X}^n$ with values in $\mathcal{X}^n$ such that

$$P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \quad (\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)), \tag{84}$$

that is, $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$, where if $\mathcal{X}^n \setminus T_n \neq \emptyset$, we choose some $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X}^n \setminus T_n$ and set

$$P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_0) = \Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_n(\lambda) = \boldsymbol{x}_0. \tag{85}$$

Notice that by this construction we have

$$|P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)| \leq \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} \tag{86}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|; m = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta_n$, and

$$\Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \notin T_n\} = \Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \leq \gamma. \tag{87}$$

Evaluation of Average Length:
The average length $\mathbb{E}[L_n]$ is evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_n] &= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \cdot m \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \cdot m \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \cdot m,
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

where we have used $\mathcal{U}^m = \bigcup_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} A_i^{(m)}$ and (84). For $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)$ we obtain from (86)

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) &\leq P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} \\
&\leq P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \left(1 + \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) K^m}\right) \\
&\leq P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where to derive the last inequality we have used (74). Plugging the inequality

$$m \leq \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} + n\gamma + 1 \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)) \tag{90}$$

and (89) into (88), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_n] &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \left(\log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} + n\gamma + 1\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \left(H(V^n) + n\gamma + 1\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[L_n] &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(V^n) + 2\gamma \\
&\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) + 3\gamma \\
&= H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 3\gamma \\
&\leq H^* + 3\gamma = R,
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where the second inequality follows from (65) and the last one is due to (64).

Evaluation of Variational Distance:
From (73) and (86) we have

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in S_n(m)} |P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})| \le \frac{|S_n(m)|\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m} \le \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^{n\gamma}}, \tag{93}$$

leading from (70) to

$$\begin{aligned} d(P_{\tilde{X}^n}, P_{V^n}) &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in T_n} |P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})| + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\notin T_n} |P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in S_n(m)} |P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})| + \frac{1}{2}\left(\Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \notin T_n\} + \Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\}\right) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^{n\gamma}} + \gamma \le \frac{1}{2}K^{-n\gamma} + \gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where we have used (87) to obtain the leftmost inequality in (94). By the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) \le d(P_{X^n}, P_{V^n}) + d(P_{\tilde{X}^n}, P_{V^n}) \le \delta + 2\gamma + \frac{1}{2}K^{-n\gamma}, \tag{95}$$

where the last inequality follows because $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n)$. Thus, we obtain from (95)

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) \le \delta + 2\gamma. \tag{96}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary and we have (92), R is $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable. □

V. δ-Variable-Length Resolvability: Divergence

So far, we have considered the problem of the variable-length resolvability, in which the approximation level is measured by the variational distance between X^n and $\tilde{X}^n$. It is sometimes of use to deal with other quantity as an approximation measure. In this section, we use the (unnormalized) divergence as the approximation measure.

A. Definitions

In this section, we address the following problem.

Definition 5 (δ-Variable-Length Resolvability: Divergence): A resolution rate $R \ge 0$ is said to be *δ-variable-length achievable* or simply $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable (under the divergence) with $\delta \ge 0$ if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \le R, \tag{97}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n) \le \delta, \tag{98}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$ and $D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n)$ denotes the *divergence* between $P_{\tilde{X}^n}$ and P_{X^n} defined by

$$D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}. \tag{99}$$

The infimum of all $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable rates:

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is } \mathrm{v}_D(\delta)\text{-achievable}\} \tag{100}$$

is called the *δ-variable-length resolvability* or simply $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-resolvability. □

To establish the general formula for $S_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$, we introduce the following quantity for a general source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Recall that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ denotes the set of all probability distributions on $\mathcal{X}^n$. For $\delta \ge 0$, defining the *δ-ball* using the divergence as

$$B_\delta^D(X^n) = \{P_{V^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n) : D(V^n||X^n) \le \delta\}, \tag{101}$$

we introduce the following quantity, referred to as the *smooth entropy* using the divergence:

$$H^D_{[\delta]}(X^n) := \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B^D_\delta(X^n)} H(V^n), \tag{102}$$

where $H(V^n)$ denotes the Shannon entropy of P_{V^n}. The $H^D_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Based on this quantity, for a general source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ we define

$$H^D_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^D_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{103}$$

The following lemma is used to derive Corollary 2 of Theorem 6 below in the next subsection.

Lemma 2: For any general source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le H^D_{[g(\delta)]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \ge 0), \tag{104}$$

where we define $g(\delta) = 2\delta^2/\ln K$, and

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{105}$$

(*Proof*) See Appendix E. □

B. General Formula

We establish the following theorem which characterizes $S^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ for all $\delta \ge 0$ in terms of the smooth entropy using the divergence.

Theorem 6: For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \ge 0). \tag{106}$$

□

Remark 8: It should be noticed that the approximation measure considered here is *not* the *normalized* divergence

$$\frac{1}{n} D(\varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})||X^n), \tag{107}$$

which has been used in the problem of δ-fixed-length resolvability [17]. The achievability scheme given in the proof of the direct part of Theorem 6 can also be used in the case of this relaxed measure. Indeed, denoting the variable-length δ-resolvability using the normalized divergence by $\tilde{S}^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$, the general formula of $\tilde{S}^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ is given in the same form as (106), if the radius of the δ-ball $B^D_\delta(X^n)$ in the definition of $H^D_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is replaced with the normalized divergence. It generally holds $S^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \ge \tilde{S}^D_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ for all $\delta \ge 0$ because the normalized divergence is less than the unnormalized divergence. □

As we have seen in Lemma 2, we generally have $S^D_{\rm v}(g(\delta)|\boldsymbol{X}) \ge S_{\rm v}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ for any $\delta \in [0,1)$ with $g(\delta) = 2\delta^2/\ln K$. In particular, in the case $\delta = 0$, we obtain the following corollary of Theorems 3 and 6.

Corollary 2: For any general target source $\boldsymbol{X}$,

$$S^D_{\rm v}(0|\boldsymbol{X}) = S_{\rm v}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{108}$$

□

Corollary 2 indicates that the $\mathrm{v}_D(0)$-resolvability $S^D_{\rm v}(0|\boldsymbol{X})$ coincides with the v-resolvability $S_{\rm v}(\boldsymbol{X})$ and is also characterized by the r.h.s. of (27). By (30), it also implies that $S^D_{\rm v}(0|\boldsymbol{X}) = R^*_{\rm v}(\boldsymbol{X})$, where $R^*_{\rm v}(\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the minimum error-vanishing achievable rate by variable-length source codes for $\boldsymbol{X}$.

Proof of Theorem 6

1) Converse Part: Let R be $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable. Then, there exists $U^{(L_n)}$ and φ_n satisfying (97) and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \delta_n \le \delta, \tag{109}$$

where we define $\delta_n = D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n)$ with $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. Equation (109) implies that for any given $\gamma > 0$, $\delta_n \le \delta + \gamma$ for all $n \ge n_0$ with some $n_0 > 0$, and therefore

$$H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) \le H^D_{[\delta_n]}(X^n) \quad (\forall n \ge n_0) \tag{110}$$

since $H^D_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Since $P_{\tilde{X}^n} \in B^D_{\delta_n}(X^n)$, we have

$$H^D_{[\delta_n]}(X^n) \le H(\tilde{X}^n). \tag{111}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (21) that

$$H(\tilde{X}^n) \le H(U^{(L_n)}) = \mathbb{E}[L_n] + H(L_n), \tag{112}$$

where the inequality is due to the fact that φ_n is a deterministic mapping and $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$.

Combining (110)–(112) yields

$$\begin{aligned} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) &= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(L_n) \le R, \end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

where we used (23) and (97) for the last inequality. Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le R. \tag{114}$$

□

2) Direct Part: We modify the achievability scheme in the proof of the direct part of Theorem 5. Without loss of generality, we assume that $H^* := \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is finite ($H^* < +\infty$). Letting $R = H^* + \mu$, where $\mu > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, we shall show that R is $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable.

Let V^n be a random variable subject to $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n)$ satisfying

$$H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) + \gamma \ge H(V^n) \tag{115}$$

for any fixed $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. We can choose $c_n > 0$ so large that

$$\gamma_0 := \Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \le \gamma \tag{116}$$

where

$$T_n := \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \le c_n \right\}. \tag{117}$$

We also define

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{x}) := \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} + n\gamma \right\rceil \quad \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n. \tag{118}$$

Letting, for $m = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta_n := \lceil n(c_n + \gamma) \rceil$,

$$S_n(m) := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \ell(\boldsymbol{x}) = m\}, \tag{119}$$

these sets form a partition of T_n:

$$\bigcup_{m=1}^{\beta_n} S_n(m) = T_n. \tag{120}$$

We set L_n so that

$$\Pr\{L_n = m\} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{\Pr\{V^n \in T_n\}} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{1 - \gamma_0}, \tag{121}$$

which satisfies

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \Pr\{L_n = m\} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in T_n\}}{1-\gamma_0} = 1, \tag{122}$$

and hence the probability distribution of $U^{(L_n)}$ is

$$P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) := \Pr\{U^{(L_n)} = \boldsymbol{u}, L_n = m\} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{(1-\gamma_0)K^m} \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m). \tag{123}$$

Construction of Mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$:
Index the elements in $S_n(m)$ as $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{|S_n(m)|}$ $(m = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta_n)$, where

$$|S_n(m)| \le K^{m-n\gamma} \tag{124}$$

(cf. (73)–(75)). For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$, define $\tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ as the set of sequences $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m$ so that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \le \frac{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}{1-\gamma_0} < \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) + \frac{\Pr\{L_n = m\}}{K^m} \tag{125}$$

and

$$\tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \cap \tilde{A}_j^{(m)} = \emptyset \quad (i \ne j). \tag{126}$$

If

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \tilde{A}_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) < \frac{1}{1-\gamma_0} \sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \Pr\{L_n = m\}, \tag{127}$$

then add a $\boldsymbol{u}_i \in \mathcal{U}^m \setminus (\cup_j \tilde{A}_j^{(m)})$ to obtain

$$A_i^{(m)} = \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \cup \{\boldsymbol{u}_i\} \tag{128}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ in order, until it holds that with some $1 \le c \le |S_n(m)|$

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{c} A_i^{(m)} \cup \bigcup_{i=c+1}^{|S_n(m)|} \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} = \mathcal{U}^m, \tag{129}$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, \cdots$ are selected to be all distinct. Since $|\mathcal{U}^m| = K^m$ and

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{(1-\gamma_0)K^m} = \Pr\{L_n = m\}, \tag{130}$$

such $1 \le c \le |S_n(m)|$ always exists. For simplicity, we set for $i = c+1, c+2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$

$$A_i^{(m)} = \tilde{A}_i^{(m)} \tag{131}$$

and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|$

$$\varphi_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{x}_i \quad \text{for } \boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}, \tag{132}$$

which defines the random variable $\tilde{X}^n$ with values in $\mathcal{X}^n$ such that

$$P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \quad (\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)), \tag{133}$$

that is, $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. Notice that by this construction we have

$$\left| P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - \frac{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}{1-\gamma_0} \right| \le \frac{\Pr\{L_n = m\}}{K^m} = \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{(1-\gamma_0)K^m} \tag{134}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |S_n(m)|; m = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta_n$, and

$$\Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \notin T_n\} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \le \gamma. \tag{135}$$

Evaluation of Average Length:
The average length $\mathbb{E}[L_n]$ is evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_n] &= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}^m} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \cdot m \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in A_i^{(m)}} P_{U^{(L_n)}}(\boldsymbol{u}, m) \cdot m \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \cdot m,
\end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

where we have used $\mathcal{U}^m = \bigcup_{i=1}^{|S_n(m)|} A_i^{(m)}$ and (133). For $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)$ we obtain from (134) and the right inequality of (135)

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) &\le \frac{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}{1-\gamma_0} + \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{(1-\gamma_0)K^m} \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_0}{1-\gamma_0}\right)\left(P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \frac{\Pr\{V^n \in S_n(m)\}}{K^m}\right) \\
&\le \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_0}{1-\gamma_0}\right)\left(1 + \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)K^m}\right) P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \\
&\le (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i),
\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

where, to derive the last inequality, we have used the fact $0 \le \gamma_0 \le \gamma \le \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \ge K^{-(m-n\gamma)} \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)). \tag{138}$$

It should be noticed that (137) also implies that

$$P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \le (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n) \tag{139}$$

since $P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \notin T_n = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\beta_n} S_n(m)$. Plugging the inequality

$$m \le \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} + n\gamma + 1 \quad (\forall \boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)) \tag{140}$$

and (137) into (136), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_n] &\le (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in S_n(m)} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\left(\log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} + n\gamma + 1\right) \\
&\le (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right)\left(H(V^n) + n\gamma + 1\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

Thus, we obtain from (141)

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] &\le (1+2\gamma)\left\{\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(V^n) + \gamma\right\} \\
&\le (1+2\gamma)\left\{\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) + 2\gamma\right\} \\
&\le (1+2\gamma)(H^* + 2\gamma),
\end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

where the second inequality follows from (115). Since we have assume that H^* is finite and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is arbitrary, the r.h.s. of (142) can be made as close to H^* as desired. Therefore, for all sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$ we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq H^* + \mu = R \tag{143}$$

Evaluation of Divergence:
The divergence $D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n)$ can be rewritten as

$$D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n) = D(\tilde{X}^n||V^n) + \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{P_{V^n}(\tilde{X}^n)}{P_{X^n}(\tilde{X}^n)}\right]. \tag{144}$$

In view of (137), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D(\tilde{X}^n||V^n) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in S_n(m)} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\beta_n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in S_n(m)} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log (1+2\gamma) \left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2\gamma}{\ln K} + \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{145}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{P_{V^n}(\tilde{X}^n)}{P_{X^n}(\tilde{X}^n)}\right] &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &\leq (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) D(V^n||X^n) \\ &\leq (1+2\gamma)(\delta+\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{146}$$

where to obtain the last inequality we used the fact that $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n)$. Plugging (145) and (146) into (144) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n) &\leq \frac{2\gamma}{\ln K} + (1+2\gamma)(\delta+\gamma) \\ &\leq \delta + \gamma(2\delta + 5), \end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

where we have used the fact that $\frac{2\gamma}{\ln K} \leq 3\gamma$ for all $K \geq 2$ and the assumption $0 < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ to derive the last inequality. Since $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is arbitrary and we have (143), R is $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable. □

VI. Mean and Variable-Length Channel Resolvability

So far we have studied the problem of *source resolvability*, whereas the problem of *channel resolvability* has been introduced by Han and Verdú [8] to investigate the capacity of identification codes [1]. In the conventional problem of this kind, a target *output distribution* P_{Y^n} via a channel W^n due to an input X^n is approximated by encoding the fixed-length uniform random number U_{M_n} as a channel input. In this section, we generalize the problem of such channel resolvability to in the variable-length setting.

A. Definitions

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be finite or countably infinite alphabets. Let $\boldsymbol{W} = \{W^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a general channel, where $W^n : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathcal{Y}^n$ denotes a stochastic mapping. We denote by $\boldsymbol{Y} = \{Y^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ the output process from $\boldsymbol{W}$ due to the input process $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where X^n and Y^n take values in $\mathcal{X}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y}^n$, respectively. Again, we do not impose any assumptions such as stationarity or ergodicity on either $\boldsymbol{X}$ or $\boldsymbol{W}$. As in the previous sections, we will identify X^n and Y^n with their probability distributions P_{X^n} and P_{Y^n}, respectively, and these symbols are used interchangeably.

In this section, we consider several types of problems of approximating a target output distribution P_{Y^n}. The first one is the problem of *mean*-resolvability [8], in which the channel input is allowed to be an arbitrary general source.

Definition 6 (δ-Mean Channel Resolvability: Variational Distance): Let $\delta \in [0, 1)$ be fixed arbitrarily. A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *δ-mean achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$* (under the variational distance) if there exists a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{\tilde{X}^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\tilde{X}^n) \leq R, \tag{148}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) \leq \delta, \tag{149}$$

where $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n$. The infimum of all δ-mean achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$:

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is } \delta\text{-mean achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\} \tag{150}$$

is referred to as the *δ-mean resolvability* for $\boldsymbol{X}$. We also define the *δ-mean resolvability for the worst input* as

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}). \tag{151}$$

□

On the other hand, we may also consider the problem of variable-length channel resolvability. Here, the variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ is defined as in the foregoing sections. Consider the problem of approximating the target output distribution P_{Y^n} via W^n due to X_n by using another input $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$ with a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$.

Definition 7 (δ-Variable-Length Channel Resolvability: Variational Distance): Let $\delta \in [0, 1)$ be fixed arbitrarily. A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *δ-variable-length achievable* or simply $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ (under the variational distance) if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq R, \tag{152}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) \leq \delta, \tag{153}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value and $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$:

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{R : \ R \text{ is } \mathrm{v}(\delta)\text{-achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\} \tag{154}$$

is called the *δ-variable-length channel resolvability* or simply $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-channel resolvability for $\boldsymbol{X}$. We also define the *δ-variable-length channel resolvability or simply $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-channel resolvability for the worst input* as

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}). \tag{155}$$

□

When W^n is the *identity mapping*, the problem of channel resolvability reduces to that of source resolvability, which had been investigated in the foregoing sections. In this sense, the problem of channel resolvability is a generalization of the problem of source resolvability.

Similarly to the problem of source resolvability, we may also use the divergence between the target output distribution P_{Y^n} and the approximated output distribution $P_{\tilde{Y}^n}$ as the approximation measure.

Definition 8 (δ-Mean Channel Resolvability: Divergence): Let $\delta \geq 0$ be fixed arbitrarily. A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *δ-mean achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$* (under the divergence) if there exists a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{\tilde{X}^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\tilde{X}^n) \leq R, \tag{156}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\tilde{Y}^n || Y^n) \leq \delta, \tag{157}$$

where $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n$. The infimum of all δ-mean achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$:

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{R: \ R \text{ is } \delta\text{-mean achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\} \tag{158}$$

is referred to as the *δ-mean channel resolvability* for $\boldsymbol{X}$. We also define the *δ-mean channel resolvability for the worst input* as

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}). \tag{159}$$

□

Definition 9 (δ-Variable-Length Channel Resolvability: Divergence): Let $\delta \geq 0$ be fixed arbitrarily. A resolution rate $R \geq 0$ is said to be *δ-variable-length achievable* or simply $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ (under the divergence) if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq R, \tag{160}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\tilde{Y}^n || Y^n) \leq \delta, \tag{161}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value and $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$:

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{R: \ R \text{ is } \mathrm{v}_D(\delta)\text{-achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\} \tag{162}$$

is called the *δ-variable-length channel resolvability* or simply $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-channel resolvability for $\boldsymbol{X}$. We also define the *δ-variable-length channel resolvability or simply $\mathrm{v}_D(\delta)$-channel resolvability for the worst input* as

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} S_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}). \tag{163}$$

□

Remark 9: Since the outputs of a deterministic mapping $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$ form a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$, it holds that

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) \leq S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)), \tag{164}$$

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) \leq S_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \geq 0) \tag{165}$$

for any general source $\boldsymbol{X}$ and general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$. These relations lead to the analogous relation for the δ-mean/variable-length channel resolvability for the worst input:

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) \leq S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)), \tag{166}$$

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) \leq S_{\mathrm{v}}^{D}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \geq 0). \tag{167}$$

□

B. General Formulas

For a given general source $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and a general channel $\boldsymbol{W} = \{W^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, let $\boldsymbol{Y} = \{Y^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the channel output via $\boldsymbol{W}$ due to input $\boldsymbol{X}$. We define

$$H_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n) = \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n, W^n)} H(V^n), \tag{168}$$

$$H^D_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n) = \inf_{P_{V^n} \in B^D_\delta(X^n, W^n)} H(V^n) \tag{169}$$

where $H(V^n)$ denotes the Shannon entropy of V^n and $B_\delta(X^n, W^n)$ and $B^D_\delta(X^n, W^n)$ are defined as

$$B_\delta(X^n, W^n) = \{P_{V^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n) : d(P_{Y^n}, P_{Z^n}) \le \delta\} \tag{170}$$

and

$$B^D_\delta(X^n, W^n) = \{P_{V^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n) : D(Z^n||Y^n) \le \delta\}, \tag{171}$$

respectively, with Z^n defined as the output from W^n due to the input V^n. Both $H_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n)$ and $H^D_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n)$ are nonincreasing functions of δ. In addition, we define

$$H_{[\delta],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n), \tag{172}$$

$$H^D_{[\delta],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H^D_{[\delta],W^n}(X^n), \tag{173}$$

which play an important role in characterizing the δ-mean/variable-length channel resolvability.

We show the general formulas for the δ-mean/variable-length channel resolvability.

Theorem 7 (With Variational Distance): For any input process $\boldsymbol{X}$ and any general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$,

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)). \tag{174}$$

In particular,

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) = S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)). \tag{175}$$

□

Theorem 8 (With Divergence): For any input process $\boldsymbol{X}$ and any general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$,

$$\overline{S}^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = S^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \ge 0). \tag{176}$$

In particular,

$$\overline{S}^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) = S^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{W}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \ge 0). \tag{177}$$

□

Remark 10: It can be easily verified that the variational distance satisfies

$$d(P_{Y^n}, P_{Z^n}) \le d(P_{X^n}, P_{V^n}), \tag{178}$$

and therefore we have $B_\delta(X^n) \subseteq B_\delta(X^n, W^n)$. This relation and formulas (49) and (174) indicate that

$$S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \le S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0,1)) \tag{179}$$

for any given channel $\boldsymbol{W}$. Likewise, it is well-known that the divergence satisfies the *data processing inequality* $D(\tilde{Y}^n||Y^n) \le D(\tilde{X}^n||X^n)$ [3], and formulas (106) and (176) lead to

$$S^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \le S^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \ge 0) \tag{180}$$

regardless of a channel $\boldsymbol{W}$. □

Remark 11: It is obvious that Theorems 7 and 8 reduce to Theorems 5 and 6, respectively, when the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the identity mapping. Precisely, for the identity mapping $\boldsymbol{W}$, the δ-mean resolvability and the $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-channel resolvability for $\boldsymbol{X}$ are given by

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{181}$$

where $\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the δ-mean resolvability $\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ for the identity mapping $\boldsymbol{W}$. The analogous relationship holds under the divergence:

$$\overline{S}^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = S^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{182}$$

where $\overline{S}^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$ denotes the δ-mean resolvability $\overline{S}^D_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ for the identity mapping $\boldsymbol{W}$. □

Proof of Theorems 7 and 8

1) Converse Part: Because of the general relationship (164), to prove the converse part of Theorem 7, it suffices to show that

$$\overline{S}_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \geq \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma], \boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{183}$$

Let R be δ-mean achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ under the variational distance. Then, there exists a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$ satisfying (148) and

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \delta_n \leq \delta, \tag{184}$$

where $\delta_n := d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n})$. Fixing $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily, we have $\delta_n \leq \delta + \gamma$ for all $n \geq n_0$ with some $n_0 > 0$ and then

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma], W^n}(X^n) \leq H_{[\delta_n], W^n}(X^n) \quad (n \geq n_0) \tag{185}$$

since $H_{[\delta], W^n}(X^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of δ. Since $P_{\tilde{X}^n} \in B_{\delta_n}(X^n, W^n)$, we have $H_{[\delta_n], W^n}(X^n) \leq H(\tilde{X}^n)$. Thus, we obtain from (148)

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma], \boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\tilde{X}^n) \leq R. \tag{186}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, this implies that we have (183).

The converse part of Theorem 8 can be proven in an analogous way with due modifications.

2) Direct Part: Because of the general relationship (164), to prove the direct part (achievability) of Theorem 7, it suffices to show that for any fixed $\gamma > 0$ the resolution rate

$$R = \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma], \boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 3\gamma \tag{187}$$

is $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ under the variational distance.

Let $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n, W^n)$ be a source satisfying

$$H(V^n) \leq H_{[\delta+\gamma], W^n}(X^n) + \gamma. \tag{188}$$

Then, by the same argument to derive (92) and (94) developed in the proof of the direct part of Theorem 5, we can construct a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[L_n] \leq \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma], \boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 3\gamma = R \tag{189}$$

and

$$d(P_{\tilde{X}^n}, P_{V^n}) \leq \frac{1}{2} K^{-n\gamma} + \gamma, \tag{190}$$

where $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. Let Z^n denote the output random variable from W^n due to the input V^n. Then, letting $\tilde{Y}^n$ be the channel output via channel W^n due to input $\tilde{X}^n$, we can evaluate $d(P_{\tilde{Y}^n}, P_{Z^n})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} d(P_{\tilde{Y}^n}, P_{Z^n}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} |P_{\tilde{Y}^n}(\boldsymbol{y}) - P_{Z^n}(\boldsymbol{y})| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \left| \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} W(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \big(P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \big) \right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} W(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \left| P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \\ &= d(P_{\tilde{X}^n}, P_{V^n}) \le \frac{1}{2} K^{-n\gamma} + \gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{191}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \to \infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) &\le \limsup_{n \to \infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{Z^n}) + \limsup_{n \to \infty} d(P_{\tilde{Y}^n}, P_{Z^n}) \\ &\le \delta + 2\gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{192}$$

where we have used the fact $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n, W^n)$ to derive the last inequality. Since $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, we can conclude that R is $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$.

The direct part of Theorem 8 can be proven in the same way as Theorem 6 with due modifications. Fixing $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n, W^n)$ and using the encoding scheme developed in the proof of Theorem 6, the evaluation of the average length rate is exactly the same and we can obtain (143). A key step is to evaluate the divergence $D(\tilde{Y}^n||Y^n)$, which can be rewritten as

$$D(\tilde{Y}^n||Y^n) = D(\tilde{Y}^n||Z^n) + \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{P_{Z^n}(\tilde{Y}^n)}{P_{Y^n}(\tilde{Y}^n)} \right]. \tag{193}$$

The first term on the r.h.s. can be bounded as

$$D(\tilde{Y}^n||Z^n) \le D(\tilde{X}^n||V^n) \le \frac{2\gamma}{\ln K} + \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \tag{194}$$

as in (145), where the left inequality is due to the data processing inequality. Similarly to the derivation of (146), the second term can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\log \frac{P_{Z^n}(\tilde{Y}^n)}{P_{Y^n}(\tilde{Y}^n)} \right] &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) W^n(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{Z^n}(\boldsymbol{y})}{P_{Y^n}(\boldsymbol{y})} \\ &\le (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) W^n(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{Z^n}(\boldsymbol{y})}{P_{Y^n}(\boldsymbol{y})} \\ &= (1+2\gamma)\left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{n\gamma}}\right) D(Z^n||Y^n), \end{aligned} \tag{195}$$

where we have used (139). Here, $D(Z^n||Y^n) \le \delta + \gamma$ because Z^n is the output via W^n due to the input $V^n \in B^D_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n, W^n)$. The rest of the steps is the same as in the proof of Theorem 6. □

VII. Second-Order Variable-Length Channel Resolvability

A. Definitions

We now turn to considering the *second-order* resolution rates [15], [21]. First, we consider the variable-length resolvability based on the variational distance.

Definition 10 ((δ, R)-Variable-Length Channel Resolvability: Variational Distance): A second-order resolution rate $L \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ is said to be (δ, R)-*variable-length achievable* (under the variational distance) for $\boldsymbol{X}$ with

$\delta \in [0,1)$ if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mathbb{E}[L_n] - nR\right) \le L, \tag{196}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) \le \delta, \tag{197}$$

where $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all (δ, R)-variable-length achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$ is denoted by

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{L : \ L \text{ is } (\delta, R)\text{-variable-length achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\}. \tag{198}$$

When $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the identity mapping, $T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ is simply denoted by $T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$ (*source resolvability*). □

Next, we may consider the variable-length resolvability based on the divergence.

Definition 11 ((δ, R)*-Variable-Length Channel Resolvability: Divergence):* A second-order resolution rate $L \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ is said to be (δ, R)*-variable-length achievable* for $\boldsymbol{X}$ (under the divergence) where $\delta \ge 0$ if there exists a variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$ and a deterministic mapping $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mathbb{E}[L_n] - nR\right) \le L, \tag{199}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} D(\tilde{Y}^n || Y^n) \le \delta, \tag{200}$$

where $\tilde{Y}^n$ denotes the output random variable via W^n due to the input $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$. The infimum of all (δ, R)-variable-length achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$ is denoted as

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) := \inf\{L : \ L \text{ is } (\delta, R)\text{-variable-length achievable for } \boldsymbol{X}\}. \tag{201}$$

When $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the identity mapping, $T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ is simply denoted by $T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$ (*source resolvability*). □

Remark 12: It is easily verified that

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{for } R < S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \\ -\infty & \text{for } R > S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}). \end{cases} \tag{202}$$

Hence, only the case $R = S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ is of our interest. The same remark also applies to $T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$. □

B. General Formulas

We establish the general formulas for the second-order resolvability. The proofs of the following theorems are given below subsequently to Remark 14.

Theorem 9 (With Variational Distance): For any input process $\boldsymbol{X}$ and general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$,

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma], W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) \quad (\delta \in [0,1), R \ge 0). \tag{203}$$

In particular,

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) - nR\right) \quad (\delta \in [0,1), R \ge 0). \tag{204}$$

□

Theorem 10 (With Divergence): For any input process $\boldsymbol{X}$ and general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$,

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma], W^n}^D(X^n) - nR\right) \quad (\delta \ge 0, R \ge 0). \tag{205}$$

In particular,

$$T_{\mathrm{v}}^D(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma]}^D(X^n) - nR\right) \quad (\delta \ge 0, R \ge 0). \tag{206}$$

□

Remark 13: As we have discussed in Section VI, we may also consider to use a general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$ as the input random variable to the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$, and we can define L to be a (δ, R)-*mean* achievable rate for $\boldsymbol{X}$ by replacing (196) and (199) with

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H(\tilde{X}^n) - nR \right) \le L. \tag{207}$$

Let $\overline{T}_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ and $\overline{T}^D_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ denote the infimum of all (δ, R)-mean achievable rates for $\boldsymbol{X}$ under the variational distance and the divergence, respectively. Then, it is not difficult to verify that

$$\overline{T}_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \in [0, 1)), \tag{208}$$

$$\overline{T}^D_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) = T^D_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W}) \quad (\delta \ge 0). \tag{209}$$

Thus, there is no loss in the (δ, R)-achievable resolution rate even if the channel input $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is restricted to be generated by the variable-length uniform random number $U^{(L_n)}$. □

Remark 14: As in the first-order case, when the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the sequence of the identity mappings, $T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$ coincides with the minimum second-order length rate of variable-length source codes. More precisely, we denote by $R^*_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$ the *minimum second-order length rate* of a sequence of variable-length source codes with first-order average length rate R and the average error probability asymptotically not exceeding δ. Yagi and Nomura [22] have shown that

$$R^*_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) - nR \right) \quad (\delta \in [0, 1), R \ge 0). \tag{210}$$

Modifying the proof of Proposition 1 (cf. Appendix D), we can show that the r.h.s. of (204) coincides with the one of (210), and therefore, it generally holds that

$$T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = R^*_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) \quad (\delta \in [0, 1), R \ge 0). \tag{211}$$

As a special case, suppose that $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a stationary and memoryless source X with the finite third absolute moment of $\log \frac{1}{P_X(X)}$. In this case, Kostina et al. [12] have recently given a single-letter characterization for $R^*_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$ with $R = H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = (1-\delta)H(X)$ as

$$R^*_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = -\sqrt{\frac{V(X)}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(Q^{-1}(\delta))^2}{2}}, \tag{212}$$

where $V(X)$ denotes the variance of $\log \frac{1}{P_X(X)}$ (varentropy) and Q^{-1} is the inverse of the complementary cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution. In view of the general relation (211), we can also obtain the single-letter characterization for $T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X})$:

$$T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}) = -\sqrt{\frac{V(X)}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(Q^{-1}(\delta))^2}{2}}. \tag{213}$$

It has not yet been clear if we can also have a single-letter formula for $T_{\rm v}(\delta, R|\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{W})$ when the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ is memoryless but not necessarily the identity mapping. □

Proof of Theorems 9 and 10

1) Converse Part: We will show the converse part of Theorem 9. The converse part of Theorem 10 can be proved in an analogous way.

Let L be (δ, R)-variable-length achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ under the variational distance. Then, there exists $U^{(L_n)}$ and φ_n satisfying (196) and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \delta_n \le \delta, \tag{214}$$

where we define $\delta_n = d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n})$. Equation (214) implies that for any given $\gamma > 0$, $\delta_n \le \delta + \gamma$ for all $n \ge n_0$ with some $n_0 > 0$, and therefore

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma], W^n}(X^n) \le H_{[\delta_n], W^n}(X^n) \quad (\forall n \ge n_0). \tag{215}$$

Since $P_{\tilde{X}^n} \in B_{\delta_n}(X^n, W^n)$, we have

$$H_{[\delta_n],W^n}(X^n) \le H(\tilde{X}^n). \tag{216}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (21) that

$$H(\tilde{X}^n) \le H(U^{(L_n)}) = \mathbb{E}[L_n] + H(L_n), \tag{217}$$

where the inequality is due to the fact that φ_n is a deterministic mapping and $\tilde{X}^n = \varphi_n(U^{(L_n)})$.

Combining (215)–(217) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H(\tilde{X}^n) - nR\right) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mathbb{E}[L_n] - nR\right) + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} H(L_n) \le L, \end{aligned} \tag{218}$$

where we have used (22) and (196) for the last inequality. Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) \le L. \tag{219}$$

2) Direct Part: We will show the direct part (achievability) of Theorem 9 by modifying the argument of Theorems 5 and 7. The direct part of Theorem 10 can be proved in a similar manner by modifying the direct part of Theorem 6 instead of Theorem 5.

Letting

$$L = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) + 2\gamma, \tag{220}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, we shall show that L is (δ, R)-variable-length achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$ under the variational distance.

We use the same achievability scheme as in the proof of Theorem 5 in slightly different parameter settings. For $\gamma > 0$, we choose $c_n > 0$ so that

$$\Pr\{V^n \notin T_n\} \le \gamma \tag{221}$$

where $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta+\gamma}(X^n, W^n)$ with $H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) + \gamma \ge H(V^n)$ and

$$T_n := \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \le c_n \right\}. \tag{222}$$

We here define

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{x}) := \begin{cases} \lceil \log \frac{1}{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} + \sqrt{n}\gamma \rceil & \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in T_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{223}$$

and $\beta_n = \lceil (nc_n + \sqrt{n}\gamma) \rceil$. Arguing similarly to the proof of Theorems 5 and 7, we can show that there exists $\varphi_n : \mathcal{U}^* \to \mathcal{X}^n$ and $U^{(L_n)}$ such that

$$d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) \le \delta + 2\gamma + \frac{1}{2} K^{-\sqrt{n}\gamma} \tag{224}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[L_n] \le \left(1 + \frac{1}{K^{\sqrt{n}\gamma}}\right) \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) + 2\sqrt{n}\gamma + 1\right). \tag{225}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(P_{Y^n}, P_{\tilde{Y}^n}) \le \delta + 2\gamma \tag{226}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mathbb{E}[L_n] - nR\right) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) + 2\gamma \\ &\le \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(H_{[\delta+\gamma],W^n}(X^n) - nR\right) + 2\gamma = L. \end{aligned} \tag{227}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary, L is (δ, R)-variable-length achievable for $\boldsymbol{X}$.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF FIRST-ORDER RESOLVABILITY AND INFORMATION QUANTITIES

Approximation Measure	Resolvability	Characterization	Theorem #
Fixed-Length Resolvability			
Variational Distance	$S_{\rm f}(\boldsymbol{X})$	$\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 1 ([8])
	$S_{\rm f}(\delta\|\boldsymbol{X})$	$\overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 2 ([17])
Variable-Length Resolvability			
Variational Distance	$S_{\rm v}(\boldsymbol{X})$	$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 3
	$S_{\rm v}(\delta\|\boldsymbol{X})$	$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} G_{\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 5
	$S_{\rm v}(\delta\|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W})$	$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 7
Divergence	$S_{\rm v}^D(\delta\|\boldsymbol{X})$	$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 6
	$S_{\rm v}^D(\delta\|\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{W})$	$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta+\gamma],\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{X})$	Theorem 8

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have investigated the problem of *variable-length* source/channel resolvability, where a given target probability distribution is approximated by transforming *variable-length uniform random numbers*. Table I summarizes the various first-order resolvability and its characterization by an information quantity. In this table, the theorem numbers which contain the corresponding characterization are also indicated.

In this paper, we have first analyzed the fundamental limit on the variable-length δ-source resolvability with the variational distance in Theorems 3 and 5. The variable-length δ-source resolvability is essentially characterized in terms of the smooth Rényi entropy of order one. In the proof of the direct part, we have developed a simple method of information spectrum slicing, in which sliced information densities quantized to the same integer are approximated by a fixed-length uniform random number of the same length. Next, we have extended the analysis to the δ-source resolvability under the unnormalized divergence in Theorem 6. The smoothed entropy with the divergence again plays an important role in characterizing the δ-source resolvability.

Then, we have addressed the problem of δ-channel resolvability. It has been revealed in Theorems 7 and 8 that using an arbitrary general source as a coin distribution (mean-resolvability problem) cannot go beyond the fundamental limit of the variable-length resolvability, in which only variable-length uniform random numbers are allowed to be a coin distribution. As in the case of source resolvability, we have discussed the δ-channel resolvability under the variational distance and the unnormalized divergence. The second-order channel resolvability has been characterized in Theorems 9 and 10 as well as the first-order case. When the variational distance is used as an approximation measure, it turned out that the *δ-source* resolvability is equal to the minimum achievable rate by variable-length source codes with the error probability less than or equal to δ. This is a parallel relationship between *fixed-length source resolvability* and the minimum achievable rate by *fixed-length source codes* [8], [17]. It is of interest to investigate if there is a coding problem for which the *δ-channel* resolvability is closely related.

When $\delta = 0$, the asymptotically exact approximation is required. In the case where the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ is the sequence of identity mappings, it turned out that the source resolvability under the variational distance and the unnormalized divergence coincides and is given by $\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X})$, where $\boldsymbol{X}$ is the target general source. This result is analogous to the dual problem of *variable-length intrinsic randomness* [5], [20], in which the maximum achievable rates of variable-length uniform random numbers extracted from a given source $\boldsymbol{X}$ are the same under the two kinds of approximation measures. It should be emphasized that in the case of variable-length intrinsic randomness, the use of *normalized* divergence as an approximation measure results in the same general formula as with the variational distance and the unnormalized divergence, which does not necessarily holds in the case of mean/variable-length resolvability (cf. Remark 8). It is also noteworthy that whereas only the case of $\delta = 0$ has been completely solved for the variable-length intrinsic randomness, we have also dealt with the case $\delta > 0$ for the variable-length source/channel resolvability.

When $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a stationary and memoryless source, the established formulas reduce to a single letter characterization

for the first- and second-order source resolvability under the variational distance. In the case where the divergence is the approximation measure and/or the channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ is a non-identity mapping, however, it has not yet been clear if we can derive a single-letter characterization for the δ-source/channel resolvability. This question remains open to be studied.

Appendix A
Proof of Lemma 1

Letting $\delta_n = 2\,d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n})$, we define

$$T_n = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n : \left| 1 - \frac{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \right| \leq \sqrt{\delta_n} \right\}. \tag{228}$$

Then, by using Markov's inequality we obtain

$$\Pr\{X^n \in T_n\} \geq 1 - \sqrt{\delta_n} \tag{229}$$

as shown by Han [4, Proof of Theorem 2.1.3]. It should be noticed that for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in T_n$ it holds that

$$1 - \sqrt{\delta_n} \leq \frac{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \leq 1 + \sqrt{\delta_n}, \tag{230}$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} + \frac{1}{n} \log(1 + \sqrt{\delta_n}). \tag{231}$$

Fix $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ arbitrarily. We choose a subset $A_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\tilde{X}^n) + \gamma \geq \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in A_n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}, \tag{232}$$

$$\Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \in A_n\} \geq 1 - \delta - \gamma. \tag{233}$$

By the definition of variational distance, it is well-known that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n &= 2 \sup_{S_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n} |\Pr\{X^n \in S_n\} - \Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \in S_n\}| \\ &\geq |\Pr\{X^n \in A_n\} - \Pr\{\tilde{X}^n \in A_n\}|, \end{aligned} \tag{234}$$

and therefore (233) indicates that

$$\Pr\{X^n \in A_n\} \geq 1 - \delta - \gamma - \delta_n. \tag{235}$$

Defining $B_n = A_n \cap T_n$, we also have

$$\Pr\{X^n \in B_n\} \geq \Pr\{X^n \in A_n\} - \Pr\{X^n \notin T_n\} \geq 1 - \delta - \gamma - \delta_n - \sqrt{\delta_n}, \tag{236}$$

where the last inequality follows from (229). On the other hand, it follows from (230) and (231) that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in B_n} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{\delta_n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in B_n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} + \frac{1}{n} \log(1 + \sqrt{\delta_n}) \right). \tag{237}$$

Then, in view of (236) and the definition of $G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$, it is easily checked that we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{[\delta+2\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in B_n} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in B_n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in A_n} P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \leq G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}), \end{aligned} \tag{238}$$

where the last inequality is due to (232). Since $\gamma \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary, taking $\gamma \downarrow 0$ for both sides yields

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq \lim_{\gamma \downarrow 0} G_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}). \tag{239}$$

By the symmetry of the argument, (239) indicates (34).

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF EQUATION (48)

(i) We first show $\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) \leq H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$.

Fix $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily. We choose $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta}(X^n)$ satisfying

$$H_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma \geq H(V^n). \tag{240}$$

It is well known that the Rényi entropy of order α defined as

$$H^{\alpha}(V^n) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})^{\alpha} \quad (\forall \alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1, +\infty))$$

satisfies

$$H(V^n) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} H^{\alpha}(V^n). \tag{241}$$

By definition, we have

$$H^{\alpha}(V^n) \geq H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) \quad (\forall \alpha \in (0,1) \cup (1, +\infty)), \tag{242}$$

leading to

$$H(V^n) = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}(V^n) \geq \lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{243}$$

Combining (240) and (243) yields

$$H_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma \geq H(V^n) \geq \lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{244}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, we obtain $\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) \leq H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$.

(ii) Next, we shall show $\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) \geq H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$.

Fix $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily. We choose some $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma \geq H^{\alpha_0}_{[\delta]}(X^n). \tag{245}$$

For this α_0 we choose $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta}(X^n)$ satisfying

$$H^{\alpha_0}_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma \geq H^{\alpha_0}(V^n). \tag{246}$$

Since $H^{\alpha}(V^n)$ is a nonincreasing function of α, we have

$$H^{\alpha_0}(V^n) \geq H(V^n), \tag{247}$$

and it follows from (245)–(247) that

$$\lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} H^{\alpha}_{[\delta]}(X^n) + 2\gamma \geq H^{\alpha_0}(V^n) \geq H(V^n). \tag{248}$$

Since $H(V^n) \geq H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$ due to $P_{V^n} \in B_{\delta}(X^n)$ and $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrarily fixed, we obtain the desired inequality.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF EQUATION (51)

To prove the alternative formula (51) for the $\mathrm{v}(\delta)$-resolvability $S_{\mathrm{v}}(\delta|\boldsymbol{X})$, we shall show

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V}) \quad (\delta\in[0,1)). \tag{249}$$

(i) We first show $\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le \inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V})$.

Fix $\gamma>0$ arbitrarily. We choose $\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}=\{\tilde{V}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$ satisfying

$$H(\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}) \le \inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V}) + \gamma. \tag{250}$$

For $\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$, we have $d(X^n,\tilde{V}^n)\le\delta+\gamma$ for all $n\ge n_0$ with some $n_0>0$, yielding

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(X^n) \le H(\tilde{V}^n) \quad (\forall n\ge n_0). \tag{251}$$

Thus, it follows from (250) and (251) that

$$H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le \inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V}) + \gamma. \tag{252}$$

Since $\gamma>0$ is an arbitrary constant, letting $\gamma\downarrow 0$ on both sides yields the desired inequality.

(ii) Next, we shall show $\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \ge \inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V})$.

Fix $\lambda>0$ arbitrarily. We choose an arbitrary decreasing sequence of positive numbers $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ satisfying $\gamma_1>\gamma_2>\cdots\to 0$. Then, we have

$$\lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = \lim_{i\to\infty} H_{[\delta+\gamma_i]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{253}$$

Also, by the definition of the limit superior, for each $i=1,2,\cdots$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma_i]}(X^n) \le H_{[\delta+\gamma_i]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + \lambda \quad (\forall n\ge n_i) \tag{254}$$

with some $0<n_1<n_2<\cdots$. Now, for each $n=1,2,\cdots$, we denote by i_n the index i satisfying

$$n_i \le n < n_{i+1}. \tag{255}$$

Then from (254), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(X^n) \le H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + \lambda \quad (\forall n\ge n_1). \tag{256}$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(X^n)$, for each $n=1,2,\cdots$, we can choose some $V_{i_n}^n \in B_{\delta+\gamma_{i_n}}(X^n)$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{n} H(V_{i_n}^n) \le \frac{1}{n} H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(X^n) + \lambda. \tag{257}$$

We now construct the general source $\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}=\{V_{i_n}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ from each $V_{i_n}^n$ for $n=1,2,\cdots$. Since $V_{i_n}^n\in B_{\delta+\gamma_{i_n}}(X^n)$ for all $n\ge n_1$ indicates that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d(X^n,V_{i_n}^n) \le \delta + \lim_{n\to\infty}\gamma_{i_n} = \delta, \tag{258}$$

the general source satisfies $\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$.

From (256) and (257), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} H(V_{i_n}^n) \le H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 2\lambda \quad (\forall n\ge n_1). \tag{259}$$

In view of (253) and the fact $\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$, taking $\limsup_{n\to\infty}$ on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in B_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})} H(\boldsymbol{V}) \le H(\tilde{\boldsymbol{V}}) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} H_{[\delta+\gamma_{i_n}]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 2\lambda \\ &= \lim_{\gamma\downarrow 0} H_{[\delta+\gamma]}(\boldsymbol{X}) + 2\lambda.\end{aligned} \tag{260}$$

Since $\lambda>0$ is an arbitrary constant, letting $\lambda\downarrow 0$ yields the desired inequality.

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Equation (56) is an immediate consequence of (55) because $\overline{H}_\delta(\boldsymbol{X})$ is a right-continuous function [4]. The rightmost inequality in (55) is due to [7], which improves a bound established in [10] and [13]. We shall show the leftmost equality: $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) = G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

(i) We first show $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

For any given $\gamma > 0$ and P_{X^n}, let $\mathcal{A}_n^* \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$ be a subset of $\mathcal{X}^n$ which satisfies

$$\Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{A}_n^*\} \ge 1 - \delta \tag{261}$$

and

$$G_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma \ge \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} =: F(\mathcal{A}_n^*). \tag{262}$$

Choose $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X}^n \setminus \mathcal{A}_n^*$ arbitrarily. Setting $P_{\tilde{X}^n}$ such that

$$P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) & \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_n^* \\ \alpha_0 & \text{for } \boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{263}$$

where we define $\alpha_0 = \Pr\{X^n \notin \mathcal{A}_n^*\}$.

The variational distance between P_{X^n} and $P_{\tilde{X}^n}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{A}_n^*} |P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) - P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{A}_n^*} (P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) + P_{\tilde{X}^n}(\boldsymbol{x})) \le \alpha_0 = 1 - \Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{A}_n^*\} \le \delta, \end{aligned} \tag{264}$$

where the last inequality is due to (261). Therefore, $P_{\tilde{X}^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)$, and this implies

$$\begin{aligned} H_{[\delta]}(X^n) \le H(\tilde{X}^n) &= F(\mathcal{A}_n^*) + \alpha_0 \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \\ &\le G_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \alpha_0 \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \gamma \\ &\le G_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \frac{\log e}{e} + \gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{265}$$

where the first inequality is due to (262) and the last inequality is due to the inequality $x \log x \ge -\frac{\log e}{e}$ for all $x > 0$. Thus, we obtain the desired inequality: $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \le G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

(ii) Next, we shall show $H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \ge G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X})$.

Assume, without loss of generality, that the elements of $\mathcal{X}^n$ are indexed as $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \cdots \in \mathcal{X}^n$ so that

$$P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \ge P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}) \quad (\forall i = 1, 2, \cdots). \tag{266}$$

For a given $\delta \in [0, 1)$, let j^* denote the integer satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j^*-1} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) < 1 - \delta, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{j^*} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \ge 1 - \delta. \tag{267}$$

Let V_δ^n be a random variable taking values in $\mathcal{X}^n$ whose probability distribution is given by

$$P_{V_\delta^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \begin{cases} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \delta & \text{for } i = 1 \\ P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) & \text{for } i = 2, 3, \cdots, j^* - 1 \\ P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - \varepsilon_n & \text{for } i = j^* \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{268}$$

where we define $\varepsilon_n = \delta - \sum_{i \geq j^*+1} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$. It is easily checked that $0 \leq \varepsilon_n \leq P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_{j^*})$ and the probability distribution $P_{V_\delta^n}$ *majorizes*[2] any $P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)$ [9]. Since the Shannon entropy is a *Schur concave* function[3] [14], we immediately obtain the following lemma, which is of use to compute $H_{[\delta]}(X^n)$.

Lemma 3 (Ho and Yeung [9]):

$$H_{[\delta]}(X^n) = H(V_\delta^n) \quad (\forall \delta \in [0,1)). \tag{269}$$

□

By the definition of $G_{[\delta]}(X^n)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_{[\delta]}(X^n) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{j^*} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} && (270)\\ &\leq H(V_\delta^n) + P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_1)} + P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_{j^*}) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}_{j^*})} && (271)\\ &\leq H(V_\delta^n) + \frac{2 \log e}{e}, && (272) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to $x \log x \geq -\frac{\log e}{e}$ for all $x > 0$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 3 that

$$G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(V_\delta^n) = H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{273}$$

which is the desired inequality.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF LEMMA 2

We first show (104). For two general sources $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} = \{\tilde{X}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, the following well-known inequality (cf. [3, Problem 3.18]) holds between the variational distance and the divergence:

$$\frac{2\big(d(P_{X^n}, P_{\tilde{X}^n})\big)^2}{\ln K} \leq D(\tilde{X}^n || X^n). \tag{274}$$

This inequality implies that any $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{g(\delta)}(X^n)$ satisfies $P_{V^n} \in B_\delta(X^n)$. Thus, we have

$$H_{[\delta]}(X^n) \leq H^D_{[g(\delta)]}(X^n). \tag{275}$$

Now, we shall show the rightmost equality of (105). It obviously follows from (104) that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} H_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \leq \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{276}$$

To show the opposite inequality, in view of (56) it suffices to show

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \geq \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} H^D_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{277}$$

Fix $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily. We choose $\mathcal{A}_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} G_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma &\geq \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_n} P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}, && (278)\\ \alpha_0 &:= \Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{A}_n\} \geq 1 - \delta. && (279) \end{aligned}$$

We arrange a new random variable V^n subject to

$$P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\alpha_0} & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{280}$$

[2]For a sequence $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_L)$ of length L, we denote by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \cdots, \tilde{u}_L)$ the permuted version of $\boldsymbol{u}$ satisfying $\tilde{u}_i \geq \tilde{u}_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, L$, where ties are arbitrarily broken. We say $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_L)$ *majorizes* $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_L)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^j \tilde{u}_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \tilde{v}_i$ for all $j = 1, 2, \cdots, L$.

[3]A function $f(\boldsymbol{u})$ is said to be *Schur concave* if $f(\boldsymbol{u}) \leq f(\boldsymbol{v})$ for any pair $(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v})$, where $\boldsymbol{v}$ is majorized by $\boldsymbol{u}$.

Then, we obtain

$$D(V^n||X^n) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}_n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{P_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \le \log \frac{1}{1-\delta}, \tag{281}$$

and thus letting $h(\delta) = \log \frac{1}{1-\delta}$, it holds that $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{h(\delta)}(X^n)$. We can expand (278) as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{[\delta]}(X^n) + \gamma &\ge \alpha_0 \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}_n} P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0 P_{V^n}(\boldsymbol{x})} \\ &\ge \alpha_0 H(V^n) \\ &\ge (1-\delta) H^D_{[h(\delta)]}(X^n), \end{aligned} \tag{282}$$

where the last inequality is due to (279) and $P_{V^n} \in B^D_{h(\delta)}(X^n)$. Thus, as $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$G_{[\delta]}(\boldsymbol{X}) \ge (1-\delta) H^D_{[h(\delta)]}(\boldsymbol{X}). \tag{283}$$

Since $\delta \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary, in view of $\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} h(\delta) = 0$ we obtain (277). □

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ahlswede and G. Dueck, "Identification via channels,"*IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 15–29, Jan. 1989.

[2] P. Elias, "The efficient construction of an unbiased random sequence," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 43, pp. 865–870, 1972.

[3] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2011.

[4] T. S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*, Springer, 2003.

[5] T. S. Han, "Weak variable-length source coding theorem," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1217–1226, Jul. 2000.

[6] T. S. Han, "Theorems on variable-length intrinsic randomness," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 2108–2116, Sep. 2000.

[7] T. S. Han, "Second-order information theory and hypothesis testing," *2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, Jeju, Korea, Oct. 2015.

[8] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, "Approximation theory of output statistics," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752–771, May 1993.

[9] S.-W. Ho and R. W. Yeung, "The interplay between entropy and variational distance," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 5906–5929, Dec. 2010.

[10] H. Koga and H. Yamamoto, "Asymptotic properties on codeword length of an optimal FV code for general sources," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1546–1555, Apr. 2005.

[11] D.E. Knuth and A.C.-C. Yao, "The complexity of nonuniform random number generation," in *Algorithms and Complexity: New Directions and Recent Results*, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 357–428, 1976.

[12] V. Kostina, Y. Polyanskiy, and S. Verdú, "Variable-length compression allowing errors," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 4316–4330, Aug. 2015.

[13] S. Kuzuoka and S. Watanabe, "An information-spectrum approach to weak variable-length source coding with side information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 3559–3573, Jun. 2015.

[14] A.W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B.C. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*, 2nd Ed. Springer, New York, NY, 2011.

[15] R. Nomura and T. S. Han, "Second-order resolvability, intrinsic randomness, and fixed-length source coding for mixed sources: information spectrum approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 1–16, Jan. 2013.

[16] R. Renner and S. Wolf, "Smooth Rényi entropy and applications," *Proc. 2004 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, Chicago, p. 232, 2004.

[17] Y. Steinberg and S. Verdú, "Simulation of random processes and rate-distortion theory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 63–86, Jan. 1996.

[18] T. Tomita, T. Uyematsu, and R. Matsumoto, "Bounds on a variable-to-fixed type δ-resolvability problem," *Poster Presentation at 2016 Symp. on Inf. Theory and its Applications*, Gifu, Japan, Dec. 2016.

[19] T. Uyematsu, "A new unified method for fixed-length source coding problems of general sources," *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, vol. E93-A, no. 11, pp. 1868–1877, Nov. 2010.

[20] S. Vembu and S. Verdú, "Generating random bits from an arbitrary source: fundamental limits," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1322–1332, Sep. 1995.

[21] S. Watanabe and M. Hayashi, "Strong converse and second-order asymptotics of channel resolvability," *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Inform. Theory*, Jun. 2014.

[22] H. Yagi and R. Nomura, "Variable-length coding with cost allowing non-vanishing error probability," *Proc. 2016 Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory and its Applications*, Monterey, CA, Oct. 2016.

[23] H. Yagi, "Characterizations of fixed-length resolvability for general sources and channels," submitted to *2017 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, Jan. 2017.